



Open House II on EIS Alternatives June 12, 2003

Summary Report

Introduction

An Open House on the Preliminary Preferred Alternative was held for the Eastside Corridor project on Thursday June 12, 2003 from 5:00–8:00 p.m. at Robert E. Lee Elementary School, located at 1455 N Baker Avenue in East Wenatchee, Washington. The Open House was the fifth public involvement event held over the two-year course of the Eastside Corridor project.

The purpose of the Eastside Corridor project, also known as the SR-28 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Study, is to prepare a detailed study that examines the environmental impacts of the concept alternatives under consideration for enhancing safety and improving North/South traffic flow between 9th Street and SR-2/97 and SR-28 intersection east of the Columbia River. The purpose of this Open House was to:

- ♦ Provide an update on the project progress since the last open house held in August 2001.
- ♦ To state the WSDOT preliminary preferred alternative and to give the public an opportunity to voice issues or concerns related to the WSDOT preliminary preferred alternative.
- ♦ To gather comments and concerns on all the alternatives, considered in the Environmental Impact Statement.
- ♦ To develop a Community Profile for the project study area, so we can fully understand the extent of the project impacts.

Participants were asked to sign in upon their arrival. As people entered the school gymnasium, they were given a comment form on the alternatives (*“Tell us what you think about any or all of the alternatives”*), a public involvement survey (*“Tell us what you find is important to your neighborhood and community”*), and a Title VI Public Involvement form (as required by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964). All handouts were available in both English and Spanish. After signing in and receiving handouts, participants meandered through several display stations set up around the room. Over 150 community members attended this Open House.

Information displays included the project purpose and need, alternative roadway alignments, NEPA environmental process, and relocation assistance. Considering the diverse community, all information was presented in both English and Spanish.

Participants had an opportunity to speak to members of the project team, to learn about the different components of the project, and also to express their thoughts, concerns, and opinions about the project. Participants' comments were recorded on flip charts located at each station. Participants were also asked to comment on each alternative via a written comment form. Comment forms were collected at the meeting, and could also be sent via mail, fax or e-mail. Translators were available all evening to assist Spanish-speaking participants with questions and comments.

All comments received from the public will be included in the project history and will be distributed to all project team members. These comments will be considered and will help guide the project's development. Following are the comments gathered (verbatim) from flip charts and written comment forms.

Public Comment on the Alternatives

The following comments were gathered (verbatim) from comment forms submitted at the Open House and those that were mailed, faxed and emailed as of September 2003. The headings given before each set of comments are listed exactly as they appeared on the survey form.

Alternative 1: One Way Couplet (Sunset Highway and Cascade Avenue)

- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ Dumb
- ♦ Can't do—would end up with street lights at every intersection north and south
- ♦ Probably far too disruptive and expensive. Doesn't address needs of traffic flow toward Badger Mountain Road and Fancher Heights.
- ♦ Too disruptive to Cascade Avenue neighborhood
- ♦ I'm against this option—traffic funnels into a bottleneck when they (roads) come together
- ♦ Bad plan—WSDOT will piss off more people than anyone wants to deal with
- ♦ Limits drivers to a right turn only, and north bound until 23rd allows for a turn around—that is a steep hill to go down anytime, especially in winter
- ♦ Too expensive
- ♦ Leave riverfront alone
- ♦ Divides neighborhoods on Cascade Avenue
- ♦ I don't care for this because it impacts more private property but will not separate residential traffic from through-traffic
- ♦ My third choice
- ♦ OK
- ♦ OK
- ♦ This seems to relieve tensions of homeowners as having less impact on their property
- ♦ Sunset Highway neighborhoods already divided
- ♦ If you can maintain traffic flow—traffic lights impede traffic flow unless synchronized
- ♦ It would be nice to have an easier way to get on the bridge from Cascade Avenue—sounds good
- ♦ My second choice
- ♦ Number one pick
- ♦ Good route
- ♦ Good choice—would reduce use on Sunset Highway and impact on Cascade Avenue, and it could be done without displacing homes
- ♦ Good idea—should help alleviate current traffic congestion
- ♦ Number one choice
- ♦ Excellent idea—the best in my estimation. The roads already exist and could be modified to facilitate this rather easily, improving connecting roads as well.

Alternative 2: Widen Sunset Highway and Cascade Avenue

- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ Dumber (than Alternative 1)
- ♦ Not Cascade Avenue

- ♦ Bottleneck at 19th
- ♦ Same as Alternative 1—divides neighborhoods on Cascade Avenue
- ♦ Almost as disruptive as Alternative 1. Also does not improve traffic flow up to Eastmont (and Badger Mountain Road)
- ♦ Any alternative making Sunset Highway a 5-lane is not a good plan for my property (Sunset Veterinary Clinic at 1500 Sunset Highway)
- ♦ What happened to freeway possibility for Sunset Highway? Freeway means limited access without lights
- ♦ Too disruptive to Cascade Avenue neighborhood
- ♦ Very expensive and would not lessen accident frequencies
- ♦ More impact due to effect on homes and businesses
- ♦ I'm against this option—it funnels traffic into same bottleneck created in Alternative 1
- ♦ This will piss off a lot more people than necessary. Only do Sunset Highway and while expanding it, make limited entrances to keep the highway flowing
- ♦ If Cascade Avenue was smooth, traffic would flow well to 19th and a free right turn onto 5-lanes. Less traffic will be on Sunset Highway near my home.
- ♦ Too expensive
- ♦ 2-way couplet doesn't make best use of existing transportation corridor
- ♦ This would separate the traffic west of Sunset Highway but do nothing for traffic on the east side. It would again impact too many people for the benefit.
- ♦ Same as Alternative 1—Sunset Highway neighborhoods already divided
- ♦ Third choice
- ♦ My third choice
- ♦ Second best option—just widen Sunset Highway
- ♦ My second choice alternative
- ♦ The second best idea (after Alternative 1)
- ♦ My first choice
- ♦ My first choice
- ♦ Sounds good
- ♦ Improved access to residence
- ♦ Better traffic flow
- ♦ Improve neighborhood
- ♦ Improving Cascade Avenue is a plus
- ♦ This is a very good route
- ♦ This is the best way—less impact on homeowners
- ♦ This method is the best way in my opinion—it's the only sensible Avenue to take
- ♦ Would lessen traffic volume on each road

Alternative 3: Widen Sunset Highway and extend Eastmont Avenue

- ♦ No
- ♦ Tough road, sand, too much traffic, stop lights on Eastmont
- ♦ No, not when Alternative 2 is available to work on
- ♦ Any alternative making Sunset Highway a 5-lane is not a good plan for my property (Sunset Veterinary Clinic at 1500 Sunset Highway)
- ♦ No—not when Sunset Highway and Cascade Avenue are 3/4 of the way there
- ♦ Widening Sunset Highway okay, but extending Eastmont is a bad idea. It will impact every view lot in East Wenatchee. The road needs to be kept north and east of the Fancher development area

- ♦ Sunset Highway needs to be taken care of. Eastmont extension is a bad idea—every view lot will be impacted
- ♦ Too expensive
- ♦ My neighborhood—please, there are so many reasons not to build here. Flood control, property values, the retaining wall (I can't imagine the size), cost, school kids
- ♦ The worst—too expensive and invasive. Crazy costs and loss of tax paying properties.
- ♦ Not too smart
- ♦ Concern about road that is alternative route through East Wenatchee
- ♦ Extending Eastmont over critical land zoning would have to change the Growth Management Act. Would this be paid for by state, county or developers? You did not address this issue—let it all be assumed as one. My opinion is that it will not go this way.
- ♦ 5-lane needs to be closely analyzed for Sunset Highway. Access restriction should be seriously considered; otherwise we will have a clone of North Wenatchee Avenue.
- ♦ This may help reduce some accidents but would be expensive and would not raise property values Eastmont is already heavily used and need upgraded so it is an obvious choice for extension. However, I would stick with one-ways in Alternative 1 and not widen Sunset Highway.
- ♦ Prefer Alternative 2 (non-connecting route off Fancher Heights)
- ♦ Must be built with sound barrier, as the traffic noise will affect many homes. Can it really be built on a 125' right-of-way considering the steep, sandy terrain? Retaining walls will have to be huge
- ♦ My second choice
- ♦ The best of the worse
- ♦ Yes
- ♦ Yes, best plan
- ♦ My first choice
- ♦ Definitely the very best route
- ♦ Sounds good
- ♦ This seems to be the best choice—it allows for better movement from the new developments along the bench and better flow along Sunset Highway
- ♦ This is by far the best; would solve the Fancher Heights access problem. It would get the most people to where they want to go and relieve the traffic on Sunset Highway. Traffic from Rock Island could more easily connect to Highway 2.
- ♦ This plan makes the most sense. We need Eastmont extended and later joined by a highway down from Fancher Heights and Badger Mountain. Sunset Highway, if widened to 5-lanes would make safer travel and handle the bulk of the traffic.
- ♦ Even though this alternative impacts me the most, it would be the best plan provided all parts of the plan are completed. It also provides more future growth if and when needed.
- ♦ I like this one the best
- ♦ I like this alternative best
- ♦ This would be the preferred route
- ♦ I think this one handles traffic volume and flow better than other alternatives, and might be less expensive as far as property purchasing and relocation goes
- ♦ I prefer this option. It gets traffic for schools, airports and Costco out of the downtown core. It gives everybody above Eastmont an easy shot to North Bridge. It provides easy connections to second Fancher access road.
- ♦ This is my choice, but extend Fancher from the north end
- ♦ Build Eastmont first

- ♦ Do Eastmont extension immediately, then alternative 2 or 3 as needed
- ♦ Improved access to residence
- ♦ Improved traffic flow
- ♦ Less traffic at time of completion
- ♦ Uses existing transportation corridor and serves the needs of businesses, agriculture and residents
- ♦ Defendable
- ♦ Will be long-term solution
- ♦ Prefer this alternative, but I think time is of the essence. How much will this cost 10, 15, 20 years from now? Will it even be feasible then? The Riverfront Highway never came to pass because the effort began too late. Prevent this from killing this project. Land purchased years ago north of Odabashian Bridge should be sold or returned to current leasers to help fund this project. Present usage should have priority—even agriculture—regardless of zoning. Property should not go to the highest bidder or the wealthiest.

Alternative 4: Western Route (300 ft from Columbia River)

- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ I'm against this option
- ♦ I'm against this alternative
- ♦ This land purchased by Washington State over 40 years ago was deemed a sensitive area by the environmentalists and a judgment stopped the highway construction. This whole process could be repeated again if construction is anticipated.
- ♦ This alternative will never happen
- ♦ Worst choice as far as environmental impact and loss of riverfront trail recreation goes. Traffic in previously quiet residential areas would be bad and the required uphill intersection roads would require much more road improvement and neighborhood disruption.
- ♦ Riverfront is too valuable
- ♦ Eventually more people will want housing near the river and it would enhance the East Wenatchee area to have housing and apartments near the river
- ♦ Too controversial
- ♦ Concept out of date with current environmental issues
- ♦ Concern about Apple Loop Trail (noise, environment)
- ♦ Stay away from the river—get over it
- ♦ Would be a terrible mistake. This is the very best area for residential and recreational growth
- ♦ Community investment in the Loop Trail has generated millions in tourist dollars. It is a crucial quality of life element to attract new economic and new business (activity). The Loop Trail was the major reason for attracting me, in my retirement, to this area.
- ♦ No, don't want it along river. It is a wonderful area to walk and enjoy the beauty around us. Let's not ruin one of the valley's assets.
- ♦ Would be best to leave waterfront for public enjoyment
- ♦ My fourth choice
- ♦ Second choice
- ♦ My second choice

- ♦ This may take care of all traffic that flows through our area, but the local traffic—that is increasing—will still use whatever roadway is closest
- ♦ I would like this one the best, but it will never happen so let's not waste the time
- ♦ Yes
- ♦ Yes, less houses impacted
- ♦ I like this one
- ♦ This one would work for me
- ♦ Do it—don't let political personalities make a bad decision
- ♦ Best route—the State already owns the right-of-way. It would be a beautiful, scenic highway for many people to enjoy
- ♦ No highway traffic, only local, would be great
- ♦ This is my favorite from a personal standpoint. The property is bought and it impacts me the least. If this property is sold it will go to the highest bidder (condos, hotels, etc.). When I built 20 years ago the planning commission was adamant about not allowing strip development down the highway and along the rivers. I had to build a residential building to fit in, now what will happen to the land?
- ♦ This would be the least expensive—it would make a great reduction in volume of traffic and fewer accidents
- ♦ Best—you already have right-of-way, project was stopped by political pressure
- ♦ Do this, it's the best—also less impact on homeowners
- ♦ Only way to relieve traffic, also cost effective
- ♦ This is the only one that will be used by all trucks and anyone going to Lake Chelan. Should have begun operation in the 1980s, but politics didn't allow for it. This is the most cost effective alternative.
- ♦ This is where the highway was supposed to be. This is where it should go. The newer homes should never have been built down there.
- ♦ Cost effective to grades and land purchases. Trail use could continue. An eagle uses the cottonwoods across from the PUD. Birds, fish, and deer survive and prosper in Tumwater Canyon. The only route that could be speedy.
- ♦ The way it should be done

Alternative 5: No-build

- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ No, we need something done
- ♦ This is not acceptable
- ♦ I don't believe this is an option
- ♦ Not an option
- ♦ Not an option for safety and economic reasons for the community We need highway improvement to handle current and future traffic
- ♦ Not an option that people who plan for future should ever consider
- ♦ Traffic needs resolution now
- ♦ Need some kind of improvement
- ♦ Have to do widening in order to make neighborhoods near highway safer
- ♦ Yes, build (as opposed to no build)
- ♦ Sunset Highway needs help. Re-route Eastmont north and east of Fancher.

- ♦ Please plan appropriately—you need to secure a second route off Fancher Heights and decide on a route from airport and Grant Road before you select an alternative. Sounds like you need a woman on your planning commission.
- ♦ Sunset Highway needs to be expanded, but Eastmont Avenue extension needs to be re-routed north and east of Fancher
- ♦ If Alternative 2 is fatally flawed, I could live with a no-build. Would have to improve other corridors, maybe doing third bridge to connect to Fifth Street in Wenatchee
- ♦ This isn't a bad idea now. The economy is lousy and during most of the day the highway isn't that busy.
- ♦ Until I get some cost figures and more detail on impacts
- ♦ Amen

Miscellaneous Comments

- ♦ Build up behind Fancher Heights—port to port parkway
- ♦ You should think about access to the beach to avoid parking problems at adjacent areas
- ♦ As the owner of Sunset Veterinary Clinic I have some concerns about impact to my business with making Sunset Avenue a 5-lane. I'm concerned about my access from Sunset Highway. I require two access points for vehicles and trailers to enter and exit. I have access to Sunset Highway now and need it for business. Disruption of business during construction—during the last widening project our business dropped, as people could not access the business. Trucks were parked in front of my door so clients couldn't enter. Contractors were relieving themselves in my parking lot. Pictures and lights rattled off the walls. My lot was used for parking, storing of materials, etc. without authorization. I did not have an advocate at WSDOT, County, etc. that was sympathetic to my needs. With lost income I am very concerned about the impact of construction and the length of time it will take for construction. Loss of property—this places the road so close to the building that it's uncomfortable. As it is with lots of traffic, we have vibration and noise concerns. How much more property of mine will you need? Will you consider moving my building back if your proposal comes too close to the building? I have already had a car slide off the highway, during a snow, and come crashing into my office wall, just missing me. We went through this once before and it wasn't pleasant or the least bit conducive for my business. I've spent over 20 years building that business up and I'm concerned it may be severely impacted. I need good exposure, noise reduction (a wall?) and good access for horse trailers to get in and out of my business. (Dr. Eric Whitener, Sunset Veterinary Clinic, 1500 Sunset Highway)

Public Comments Derived From Public Involvement Survey Forms

The following comments were gathered (verbatim) from survey forms submitted at the Open House and those that were mailed, faxed and emailed as of September 2003. The questions given before each set of comments are listed exactly as they appeared on the survey form.

Are there any recreation facilities or areas that you enjoy that may be changed by the widening of an existing roadway or construction of a new roadway?

- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ No

- ♦ No, it is not safe to set out on a bike from my place
- ♦ Not that I know of.
- ♦ I do not see any.
- ♦ We do not want the trail to be taken away, we worked too long to get it.
- ♦ The Apple Valley Loop Trail would lose its appeal if a road is located 300 ft from the Columbia River.
- ♦ None, except for along the river. The path is a valuable resource for walking, biking, etc.
- ♦ Apple Loop Trail a plus. Riverfront options appear to have lower score on environmental impact (second level screening matrix analysis)
- ♦ Yes, it will make it extremely hard to get from my house to the trail
- ♦ The river route doesn't seem to impact the trail—we bike it often
- ♦ Sunset Highway expansion is fine, but Eastmont extension will ruin the view lots in East Wenatchee.
- ♦ I love looking up at our beautiful hills. Wenatchee has always been my home; it already saddens me that so many orchards have been taken away. But now you want to take away our wonderful hills. A road on Eastmont will be a big ugly scar.
- ♦ By creating one-way streets from Sunset Highway and Cascade Avenue it would leave East Wenatchee a beautiful town instead of an ugly concrete and blacktop by-pass
- ♦ Yes, I use the area around the bridge to exercise my dog by the river, which is going to change due to any of the alternatives.

Are there any important places for meetings and gatherings that may be impacted by the widening of an existing roadway or the building of a new roadway?

- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ No, river route would go through DCTLS building
- ♦ Cascade Unitarian Universalist Fellowship at 1550 Sunset Highway. We have 80-100 members that use the main sanctuary and religious education building every week. Our buildings are near the highway and expansion to the west will interfere with adult spiritual services and endanger our children. We will need to alter our main building and relocate and rebuild our Sunday school.
- ♦ Three or more churches
- ♦ Unless WSDOT commits quickly to a plan blocking further barriers the choices will diminish. A definite plan 10 years ago would have been better. So act quickly or block all development in considering options to return flexibility.
- ♦ Yes, my house—parking would be much more difficult for friends and business associates who come to my house (I run my business out of my home)
- ♦ If Eastmont is extended, beautiful homes will be taken out and family gatherings at home will be taken away
- ♦ Yes, the commercial impact that is sure to follow using a highway that doesn't have limited access will spill over into my home area
- ♦ The river route would take out the new county building
- ♦ The grange will be impacted
- ♦ I pray for a safer roadway and leave it all in our hands, also the response of the people involved

Is there anything that you want us to know about your neighborhood? For instance, what changes might there be to your neighborhood and quality of life as a result of project impacts?

- ♦ Widening Sunset Highway again takes 1/2 of our property
- ♦ I am extremely concerned for my area (Fancher Heights). There has been continuous building but no provision for road access as originally called for in our planning. Eastmont expansion will give 500 homes the best opportunity to provide safe access.
- ♦ The cars coming off of the Fancher Heights area will need a rapid means to transition onto the Eastmont Highway, should it be selected for extension to the bridge
- ♦ Concern about noise and stability of hillside below Fancher Heights
- ♦ Desire second route from Fancher Heights but not as an alternate way through East Wenatchee. Concern that extension of Eastmont Avenue may have this result.
- ♦ The Eastmont extension will wreck a lot of quiet neighborhoods
- ♦ The Eastmont extension will need to go through many new expensive homes. The homes that remain will lose all property value and the many neighborhoods will no longer be peaceful.
- ♦ The Eastmont extension is ridiculous. So many beautiful homes and building sites would be ruined. Totally excessive.
- ♦ The amount of accidents would go down and property values would go up, especially if Alternative 4 is used
- ♦ The increased traffic in Alternative 3 will make my home less desirable. I just moved there 2 weeks ago and I do not want more traffic on Eastmont.
- ♦ If Alternative 3 is the selected alternative, our property will be adjacent to the right-of-way. Property values will be affected.
- ♦ If Alternative 3 is picked, I would like to make sure the Eastmont extension is tied into the second access to the Fancher Heights area. Are the State and Douglas County coordinating this effort?
- ♦ Close off several roads leading to Sunset Highway and consolidate them. There are too many children standing on the highway waiting for the school bus and playing too close to the highway.
- ♦ Is there any way to get children across five lanes of traffic safely? Crosswalks at certain intersections have been proven not to work
- ♦ A 5-lane Sunset Highway divides our community even more
- ♦ I like the previous work of making turning lanes, thanks
- ♦ I live two blocks from Eastmont. Alternative 3 probably benefits me most.
- ♦ We do not live in the project area, we just use it
- ♦ No

Of the widening of an existing roadway or building a new roadway changes the surroundings of where you live, what could be done to lessen the impacts before and after the construction of the roadway?

- ♦ Agreement to compensate for relocation on our property
- ♦ Buy my property (Bonni Martin)
- ♦ Lots of money—somehow lessen noise from traffic spreading across and down the fill from Eastmont extension
- ♦ Noise barriers, underground utilities
- ♦ Sound abatement.
- ♦ Probably nothing. Noise will be the main problem.

- ♦ Will need a good means of transitioning the second access road off of Fancher Heights to the new highway
- ♦ Move the Eastmont extension east of Fancher Heights development
- ♦ We need to move the extension east of Fancher Heights development. This way we will not hurt people and their homes.
- ♦ Building the river route is the very least impact on the community—affects fewer homes, fewer families and won't put an east-west barrier in our community
- ♦ Keep dust down and get it done fast (safety) also that you get the funds for this very soon
- ♦ Reduce Eastmont speed limit to 25 or 30 mph. Cut down noise.

Is there anything you want us to know about what modes of transportation you may use to get around in the area? Is there anything we may be changing? Will the project be changing the mode of transportation you currently use by construction of one of the alignments?

- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ No
- ♦ No change in mode of transportation
- ♦ No, don't think so
- ♦ Nearly all (church) members (Cascade Unitarian Universalist Fellowship at 1550 Sunset Highway) arrive by car so highway access in a safe manner is vital
- ♦ Our area (Fancher Heights) needs public bus transportation. We are now 500 homes and many cars. Better access is needed.
- ♦ Should have link extend route into Fancher Heights area to reduce need for cars to transport people off and on to Fancher
- ♦ Yes, if you change any roadway to a one-direction road
- ♦ My children ride the bus and I don't often drive—I'm a stay at home mom
- ♦ Will the SR-28 five-lane lessen the number of driveways on it?
- ♦ We will still drive both vehicles, but it seems with Sunset Highway 5-lane it could take us even longer to access the road
- ♦ Use the bus more

Do you have any additional comments on the four proposed alternatives?

- ♦ Consider the one that goes off Odabashian Bridge up Fancher Heights area, in front or behind
- ♦ We like Fancher Bench idea
- ♦ Eastmont extension is a great option
- ♦ Extension of Eastmont to bridge would be the preferred alternative
- ♦ The Eastmont extension shouldn't happen. That road needs to be east of Fancher Heights.
- ♦ The Eastmont extension is a very bad idea. To strip Wenatchee of all the quaintness is so very sad. I have lived here all my life and never thought the town would be defaced.
- ♦ This affects our properties off 23rd and Sunset Highway
- ♦ I prefer Alternative 3—would like to see Cascade Avenue done first
- ♦ Please pick one so the dust will settle and people can get on with their plans. Not knowing is the worst thing.
- ♦ Would prefer Alternative 2 or one that I did not see featured, such as taking the through-traffic along the foothills

- ♦ Alternative 4 still makes the most sense since the right-of-way is already owned, a lesser number of houses will be destroyed, and we'll have more parks and public access to the river. I still do not understand why this highway wasn't built 20 years ago.
- ♦ Get federal money and make some changes before children end up dead on that highway
- ♦ The pedestrian traffic east and west would be endangered, both children on the way to school and people going to the trail
- ♦ I like the river route. It doesn't seem like there would be as many homes impacted
- ♦ It is a badly needed project
- ♦ It's hard to see to get onto the highway

Public Comments Derived From Flip Charts

The following comments were collected on flipcharts located at each of the stations. The comments are organized by station.

Alternative 1

- ♦ For local residents could become long detour to get to houses
- ♦ What is dollar difference with taking all these (alternatives) verses Alternative 4? \$20-30 million?
- ♦ I say no to Alternative 1, 2 and 3
- ♦ I feel this is very divisive to community development, destroys a lot of homes and when you get done, there is no need for the road improvements

Alternative 2

- ♦ I prefer Alternative 3
- ♦ I also prefer Alternative 3 (I'm a Valley View resident)
- ♦ Me, too, I prefer Alternative 3
- ♦ Better build the county road first or the land will have new homes on it and the cost will be unreal, you will have to do it sooner or later, think of the future, Alternative 3 is a lot better
- ♦ I prefer Alternative 2
- ♦ How many children will we lose crossing a 5-lane highway on the way to school? Add (signaled stop) lights
- ♦ I prefer Alternative 2, not Alternative 3

Alternative 3

- ♦ Alternative 3 is horrible
- ♦ The highest value view lots in Douglas County will be wiped off the tax roles forever with this approach
- ♦ Who will buy these expensive lots only to look at a highway?
- ♦ Douglas County and everyone loses with this approach
- ♦ Overall impact of Alternative 3 on individual, business and retail is highly negative
- ♦ Devaluation of property along Eastmont, Briarwood and surrounding areas needs to be calculated in total expense of project
- ♦ Current desirability of land along Eastmont is some of the highest in GWV.
- ♦ Alternative 3 is best—Alternative 1 and 2 routes through town, Alternative 2 has minimal residential disruption
- ♦ Alternative 3 is a 'no'

- ♦ Extending Eastmont would go along the critical land zoning; the Growth Management Act would have to be change; also the ground is unstable for a highway; it's sand and too steep; fossils have been found in this area; the Colville Tribe have an interest in this land
- ♦ Alternative 3 would leave a huge scar across the face of East Wenatchee due to large cut and fill required for sand slopes that are there; fugitive dust would be an ongoing issue due to constant wind that blows through the area; stormwater runoff control and mitigation would also be an issue and add to the already large cost of construction on the slopes and canyon; only local traffic would use this Eastmont extension, not through traffic; a revised Alternative 3 should be considered to extend to the top (Fancher area) to alleviate second access and provide for future bypass to Batterman Road; this also allows for future development (i.e., tax revenue)
- ♦ I totally agree with the immediately previous comments (bullet point noted above); the extension of Eastmont is an environmental disaster due to noise reverberation, water runoff control, the scar on the valley and the unstable sand with the same clay that exists on Badger Mountain Road
- ♦ An over-the-bench route from Odabashian to the airport gives Fancher their second access and opens the upper bench to strong economic development that benefits Douglas County and future traffic management—please plan ahead rather than look back

Alternative 4

- ♦ This is the only one to alleviate the traffic
- ♦ The state already owns most of the right-of-way instead of the financial burden of widening Sunset Highway
- ♦ Still has environmental issues even at 300 ft from ordinary high-water mark; adjacent lands policy of shoreline management act
- ♦ Alternative 4 makes most sense economically and less impact on homeowners; not a problem with the environment
- ♦ Best route has to be the river because the other routes will not be limited right-of-way and there will be, without a doubt, commercial activity all along it and it will be clogged in no time; the other problem is getting children to the Lee and Cascade Schools when they have to cross a 5-lane highway
- ♦ Flatter grad, less impact on residential
- ♦ Save how many millions of dollars over other alternatives since WSDOT already owns most of right-of-way
- ♦ Odabashian interchange, ramps, over-crossing already built, making access Odabashian north to Rocky Reach from interchange more feasible
- ♦ Still cheapest rout and saves tax payer dollars
- ♦ Route ruins waterfront access and valuable tax paying property; do not consider this route

Alternative 5

- ♦ No comments recorded on flip chart for this Alternative

Environmental Review

- ♦ Please check for light pollution